

Coltrain, Katrina

From: Werkema, Dale
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 12:55 PM
To: Coltrain, Katrina; Kady, Thomas; Powell, Greg; Prince, George
Cc: Downham, Todd
Subject: Re: Wilcox Refinery Geophysical Approach and Budgetary estimate
Attachments: Wilcox refinery geophysics approach review_Werkema.docx

All,

Attached is my review/ 2 cents. I am happy to discuss as needed. After Thursday I am out of the office until July 23rd; but might be able to access email occasionally.

Best,

Dale Werkema, Ph.D.
U.S. EPA, ORD, NERL, ESD, CMB
944 E. Harmon Ave.
Las Vegas, NV. 89119
(702) 798-2263

From: Coltrain, Katrina
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2015 9:22 AM
To: Kady, Thomas; Powell, Greg; Prince, George
Cc: Downham, Todd; Werkema, Dale
Subject: RE: Wilcox Refinery Geophysical Approach and Budgetary estimate

Team, I have reviewed the geophysical approach and have the following questions and comments. If you have any questions regarding my review, please give me a call or send an email.

Thanks

EM31 and EM61 surveys:

I have no comments on the use of these surveys. I agree that they should be used in the process and north process areas. We do not have full access to the north process area. See attached pdf, reference property 2 and 13. We are working to identify the owner for property 2, and working to get a signed access agreement with property 13. We may need to alter the tracks just a bit if we are not able to get access by field time. Specifically, the northern end of the green track line may need to be adjusted..

The north process area is also thickly vegetated. This may slow progress.

If needed, we have access to a triangle wedge just north of the Process area. Indicated with yellow.

MASW Seismic

The MASW is planned for the Tank Farm Area. This area includes 4 properties, only one of which the owner has agreed to mow. The other three properties have homes and are currently occupied. Refer to the Wilcox Property ownership pdf attached to this email.

The property furthest east (Property 6) has an old tank in the front yard. Sampling of this property confirmed the presence of oil material at depths about 2-8ft.

The owner of the property just to the west (Property 5) has indicated that at the back of the property there is waste material. I have not verified that surface waste exists; however, an old tank was located on the back of this property.

Areas of interest are indicated in orange. We are interested in these areas and preferential pathways associated with these tank locations.

The property (Property 4) next to the field has a fenced pit. We are interested in this area and preferential pathways associated with the pit. Area indicated in light blue. Refer to the 1941 pdf attached to this email.

Aerial photographs indicate there were two areas on the east side of the drainage (Property 6) where tanks were either removed or the areas were prepped for tanks that were never installed. We need to investigate and hopefully determine that the eastern portion of the site has not been impacted by waste material. Refer to the 1941 pdf attached to this email.

The text indicates that the initial effort will focus on the tracks identified in the figure and marked as blue and pink. Once completed, then additional tracks across the properties will be investigated. I have included some suggested locations in black that can be used to address the issues identified above. Refer to the ERT Geophysics proposal draft 7-6-15 pdf attached to this email.

1. Can the number of tracks cited for the southwest corner of the field (Property 7) be reduced so that additional tracks across other parts of the site can be done?
2. When you have a better idea of the dates, we will need to coordinate with the property owners/tribes to let them know what we are planning and when.

Katrina Higgins-Coltrain
Remedial Project Manager
US EPA Region 6
LA/OK/NM Section
1445 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75202
214-665-8143



From: Kady, Thomas
Sent: Wednesday, July 01, 2015 2:06 PM
To: Powell, Greg; Prince, George
Cc: Coltrain, Katrina
Subject: Fwd: Wilcox Refinery Geophysical Approach and Budgetary estimate

George/Greg - Comments on this? I've included Katrina on this email, as time is short and we're all in the field. Tom

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Leuser, Richard M" <richard.m.leuser@lmco.com>
Date: June 30, 2015 at 4:45:28 PM EDT
To: "Kady, Tom (Kady.Thomas@epa.gov)" <Kady.Thomas@epa.gov>
Cc: "Prince, George (Prince.George@epa.gov)" <Prince.George@epa.gov>, "George Prince (Prince.George@epamail.epa.gov)" <Prince.George@epamail.epa.gov>, "rleuser@rcn.com" <rleuser@rcn.com>
Subject: Wilcox Refinery Geophysical Approach and Budgetary estimate

Tom,

Attached is the Geophysical Approach, a figure showing proposed traverses and two cost estimates. The first is for the geophysical survey with all ODC's, eight field staff and their travel and expenses. The second is for an additional four people to add two additional field crews to staff the EM Equipment. With time growing short, I've drafted the QAPP and have sent it over to Beth to review and edit, after which I'll have Donna finish it up so it's ready once the Work Assignment arrives. Have a look and let me know if I can be of further service on this.

Have a great day!

Richard M. Leuser, PE
Deputy Program Manager

Lockheed Martin SERAS
2890 Woodbridge Avenue, Building 209 Annex
Edison, NJ 08837

732-494-4060 Office
908-803-2556 Cell
richard.m.leuser@lmco.com

The Geophysical Approach for the Wilcox Refinery Level of Effort (LOE) 6-30-15 document provides a good overview of the rationale for the work to be performed, the time needed, and the cost estimate. I am aware of a few of the geophysicists noted in the document and understand them to be competent and capable. Below I detail a few thoughts and comments in my review of the document.

It makes sense to have a seismic team, but the EM31 and EM61 may not warrant two separate teams (unless of course there are 4 instruments). The operation of these EM instruments requires one person per instrument and then maybe 2 people max to "guide" the data acquisition people along the correct line and prepare the next line. Hence, there would be a seismic team and an EM team. The EM31 and EM61 data acquisition will walk the same lines, so the line locations are the same for these instruments. However, it is very important that when acquiring the data each instrument is separated by enough distance to eliminate possible instrument interference.

I agree a 20 year old seismograph is generally not a good idea. There are too many uncertainties with data quality and instrument stability, especially if the instrument is not regularly used and maintained. If it has been used regularly and has good data quality, then it should be fine. I have used a 20+ year old Geometrics Strataviewer which works great; but it is used frequently and is well maintained. It is typically not the seismic instrument that degrades, rather it is the wires, take out cables, and particularly the trigger cable and switch.

Different EM31 and EM61 instruments collecting data on the same site will likely generate dissimilar absolute data that will need to be leveled if they are to be combined into one grid. This issue is mostly observed with the EM31; but both instruments require a calibration. The different calibration procedures/techniques per instrument and different operators (mostly due to different operator height) will yield different absolute data; but similar relative data. This variability is readily observed in the results. It is best to try and use the same instrument and the same operator throughout the survey. If this is not possible, then procedures should be noted, and planned, for calibration and data correction/leveling.

The LOE 6-30-15 document states, the bulk of the EM data will be profiles acquired along roads and old trails. It is not clear how this acquisition will be useful to achieve the objectives. It seems unlikely that leftover foundations or tanks are located buried under roads and trails. If the survey is performed along the road then utilities may be observed; however they may not be EM anomalies as the surveys will be parallel to the roads and utilities are typically buried parallel to the road. The EM surveys might pick up utilities crossing orthogonal to the road; but this depends on the road conditions. It is important to note that these EM instruments are not utility, tank, or foundation detectors. They measure the electromagnetic properties of the earth below their survey location. There are three fundamental EM properties of matter; electrical conductivity, magnetic

permeability, and relative permittivity. An EM property contrast within the earth is required to detect any EM anomalies, which might be due to a utility, foundation, or tank. If surface conditions (i.e., road) exhibit high EM property values then it will mask the response from deeper objects. This is typical of roads and the EM response. If site conditions prohibit a grid type survey, then that is the reality of the site; but an EM grid survey would likely investigate the site in a more inclusive manner and better serve the EM survey objectives. If possible, I encourage the development of an acquisition grid. It is not unusual for a site such as this to require a week of grid set up, then a week (or less) of EM data collection. The grid set up could likely be the largest effort.

The MASW field procedures are correct. However, I am not fully convinced this is the best and only method to achieve the objectives. I trust there has been some thought on this matter and I am coming late to the discussion, so that is fine. In my opinion, an induced polarization (IP) survey done in concert with the MASW would yield less uncertainty in the results and provide a different geophysical measurement as converging lines of evidence to achieve the objectives. Furthermore, IP surveys (and the resistivity that one collects with it) have been shown to delineate contaminant plumes of various types and degrees of degradation, so this may also help to guide direct push/well/sample locations. Of course, this would cost more and the budget might preclude this possibility. Has there been any forward modeling for the MASW survey? This is an excellent (and highly recommended) method to predict expected results and determine field acquisition parameters. Perhaps it has been performed since the geophone spacing and shot spacing was noted. It might be interesting to look at the models, if they exist, or maybe the acquisition parameters were determined through back of the envelope calculations. A forward model could also be generated for resistivity and IP to test its utility and acquisition details.

I found nothing in the document about data quality controls or data quality objectives. How will these be determined? How will it be shown the data are of sufficient quality and the instruments performed properly throughout the survey? How will the EM instruments (in particular the EM31) be calibrated (the instrument manuals provide a detailed procedure) and how will these calibrations be documented? How will the data be processed? Will there be site geologic or hydrogeologic controls placed into the inversion models to constrain the model fit? Does the LOE cost include data processing and interpretation?